C.D. 100/

SINGLE BENCH (1)

(3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH BILASPUR

Writ petition no-1492-/2005

PETITIONER - -------

RAVI SHANKAR PATEL
Aged about 44 years, Son of
Shri Hari krishna Patel,
Resident of village Pirda
Tah. Saraipali.
Distt.- Mahasamund (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS ----------

1- STATE OF CHHATTISGARH
Through Secretary
School Education Department
Mantralaya D.K.S Bhawan
Raipur(C.G.)

2- Director of Public Instructions
Govt. of Chhattisgarh
Directorate of PublicInstructions
(DPI Office) Pension Bada
Raipur (C.G.)

3- Deputy Director of Public
Instructions
Government of Chhattisgarh
Education Department
Education District Mahasamund
(C.G.)

P.R. No. 1482/05
Presented by Shri A. Tak High
dated 6/6/05

RECEIVED-COPY
6.6.05
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(18)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP No. 1492/05 **सन्** 200

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	19-4-2005 Mr. Alok Nigam, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Akhil Agrawal, Panel Lawyer for the State. Heard both the counsel. The case of the petitioner is that in the year 1981 the Education Department of the erstwhile State of Madhya Pradesh conducted a test for appointment of ad-hoc Assistant Teachers in the Government Primary Schools. In that test the petitioner was selected and accordingly, he was appointed for a period of three months on a fixed salary of Rs.350/- per month. However, the services of the petitioner were discontinued and the vacancy, which arose on account of discontinuation of the petitioner's services, was filled by the State of Madhya Pradesh. Thereafter, the petitioner is regularly making representations for considering the petitioner for appointment on the post of Teacher. Further case of the petitioner is that in the year 1997 the erstwhile State of M.P. took a decision to appoint ad-hoc teachers in place of Shiksha Karmi but the same is not being implemented by the State of Chhattisgarh. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to respondent No.2 raising all his grievances and respondent No.2 be directed to decide his representation, to which learned counsel for the State of Chhattisgarh has no objection. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.2 within ten days from today raising all his grievances, and in turn, respondent No.2 is directed to consider the representation made by the petitioner and decide the same within a period of three months from the date of the receipt of the representation in an objective	

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(14)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP/20/1492/05 **सन्** **200**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित — 2 —	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	manner after considering the grievances of the petitioner, in accordance with law. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, I.A.Nos.2837/2005 and 2838/2005 also stand disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Soma